

1 Logan Municipal Council Logan, Utah December 2, 2025

3 Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on
4 Tuesday, December 2, 2025, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290
5 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 5:30 p.m. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are
6 televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and the City of Logan YouTube channel
7 at: bit.ly/LoganCouncilMeetings

9 Councilmembers present at the beginning of the meeting: Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds,
10 Vice Chair Mike Johnson, Councilmember Ernesto López, and Councilmember Amy Z.
11 Anderson. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, City Attorney Craig Carlston,
12 Finance Director Richard Anderson, and City Recorder Teresa Harris.

13 Councilmember Mark A. Anderson announced his resignation from the Council on
14 November 17, 2025 so he can prepare to take office as Mayor in January 2026.

15 Chair Simmonds welcomed those present. There were approximately 36 in attendance at
16 the beginning of the meeting.

17 **OPENING CEREMONY:**

18 Fire Chief Nate Thompson provided the opening ceremony and led the audience in the
19 pledge of allegiance.

20 **Meeting Minutes.** Minutes of the Council meeting held on November 18, 2025 were
21 reviewed and approved.

22
23 **Meeting Agenda.** Chair Simmonds announced there are four public hearings scheduled
24 for tonight's Council meeting.

25
26 ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson
27 to approve tonight's agenda and minutes from the November 18, 2025 Council
28 meeting as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).

29 A. Anderson: Aye

30 Johnson: Aye

31 López: Aye

32 Simmonds: Aye

33 VACANT

35 **Meeting Schedule.** Chair Simmonds announced that regular Council meetings are held
36 on the first and third Tuesdays of the month at 5:30 p.m. The next regular Council
37 meeting is Tuesday, December 16, 2025.

39 QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL:

41 **Chair Simmonds explained that any person wishing to comment on any item not**
42 **otherwise on the agenda may address the City Council at this point by stepping to the**
43 **microphone and giving his or her name and address for the record. Comments should**
44 **be limited to not more than three (3) minutes unless additional time is authorized by**
45 **the Council Chair. Citizen groups will be asked to appoint a spokesperson. This is the**
46 **time and place for any person who wishes to comment on non-agenda items and items**
47 **that are germane or relevant to the authority of the City Council. Items brought**
48 **forward to the attention of the City Council will be turned over to staff to respond to**
49 **outside of the City Council meeting**

50 Paul Rogers, a resident of Logan spoke about the disappointing dissolution of BPAC
51 (Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee). He has been a member for many years and
52 considers the topic important for the City of Logan. He requested that the City adopt a
53 similar committee for the City of Logan in 2026 which advocates for cyclists and
54 pedestrians.

55 There were no further comments or questions for the Mayor or Council.

56 **MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:**

57 **Update on Energy Projects – Tyson Godfrey, Resource Manager Light & Power**
58 **Department ([6:00](#))**

59 Tyson Godfrey, Resource Manager with the Logan Light & Power Department,
60 addressed the Council.

61 Current peak load of the City is 100 MW. (It is down a few MW from last year). Over the
62 last 3 months 18% of energy was renewable, 58% dispatchable (coal, gas, local
63 generation), 25% market rate.

64 Currently, there is a shortfall of power until April 2026.

65 EDAM (Extended Day-Ahead Market) will become live on May 2026.

66 **Renewable Resources:**

67 • CRSP Hydro (CC) – 8 to 15 MW
68 • Pleasant Valley Wind (WD) - 3.6 MW
69 • Red Mesa Solar (RD) – 5 MW
70 • Steel B Solar – 5.8 MW
71 • Veyo Heat Recovery (captures heat from gas pipelines/does not use gas) – 2.2
72 MW

73 **Dispatchable Resources:**

74 • Hunter Unit II (coal) – 12.6 MW

75 • Sunnyside (coal) – 5 MW (Permanently OFFLINE)
76 • Nebo Power Station (gas capture) – 17.3 MW (currently only at 50% will return
77 by April 2026).
78 • Intermountain Power (changing to gas) – currently offline/will go online again

79 **Local Generation:**

80 • Logan Hydro currently produces 1.2 MW (varies by year).
81 • Logan Generation (SOCC) – gas turbine, 13 MW. (Turned on as needed)
82 • Sub 9 Generator – 10 MW (currently under construction by April 2026)

83 **New Firm Resources:**

84 • Fremont Solar Battery – 10 MW solar & 5MW Battery (by Dec 2027)
85 • Millard County Peaking (gas) - 26.25 MW (which will be used as needed)
86 • Power County (gas) – 15 MW (by 2031, primary use)

87 **Potential Resources:**

88 • Local Solar Development on Lagoons – 8MW Study Initiated
89 • Honey Stone Solar & Storage – Zoning Denied by Cache County
90 • Geothermal – 2 MW Study Phase (more MW may be possible for greater cost)
91 • Wind Projects – On hold due to tariffs and changes to federal policy

92
93 Chair Simmonds inquired about the meaning of dispatchable energy.

94 Tyson Godfrey, Resource Manager responded that dispatchable energy means energy that
95 can be controlled/scheduled for use or turned off as needed.

96 Vice Chair Johnson asked if there is any geothermal energy that is part of the renewable
97 portfolio.

98 Mr. Godfrey answered that currently there is none, but there will be geothermal energy
99 that will be added to the portfolio.

100 Councilmember A. Anderson inquired when the Hunter energy project will go offline.

101 Mr. Godfrey replied that the Hunter project is set to go offline about 2030.

102 Vice Chair Johnson asked when the Sunnyside project went offline, and whether the City
103 owes anything for the project not running.

104 Mr. Godfrey responded that Sunnyside went offline about 2 months ago, and the City
105 does not need to pay for the project, which is not running as the project is indefinitely
106 offline.

107 Councilmember López inquired about the risks associated with the upcoming firm
108 resources.

109 Mr. Godfrey answered that locations are still being finalized for the projects, bids from
110 contractors, and so forth. They will start spending on some items/deposits for items such
111 as generators as they have a 4 to 5 year wait for completion.

112 Councilmember A. Anderson asked for the reasoning behind the denial made by the
113 Planning Commission.

114 Mr. Godfrey replied that the Planning Commission did not elaborate. The proponent
115 plans to reapply again in the future.

116 Mayor Daines interjected and clarified that the primary reason for denial was that the
117 Planning Commission was concerned about the visual appearance of the project.

118 Mayor Daines requested for the benefit of the public a brief summary of what the EDAM
119 (Extended Day-Ahead Market) is.

120 Mr. Godfrey explained that EDAM (Extended Day-Ahead Market), is a market that
121 involves the western power grid, and it will change how the City will purchase energy on
122 the market. There are specific requirements that will have to be met such as having
123 sufficient energy capacity or being charged a fee for lack thereof.

124 Mayor Daines requested that if a training is put together for EDAM, the Council &
125 Mayor be invited.

126 Mr. Godfrey confirmed that the Council & Mayor will be invited once the training is
127 available.

128 Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that EDAM will become live on May 01,
129 2026.

130 Mr. Godfrey said that the date is set in stone; the date will not change.

131 Councilmember López inquired if there is a possibility of surcharges with Nebo running
132 at half capacity until April 2026.

133 Mr. Godfrey responded that they anticipate still being able to remain within budget.
134 Some of the block purchases will help with that, and as of now the market rates have
135 begun to go with the onset of winter.

136 Councilmember A. Anderson referenced the potential resources slide and asked what
137 other solar study options are available.

138 Mr. Godfrey explained that the options are local battery storage at Sub 7 or 9, about
139 8MW at the sewer lagoons, and possible small solar projects on various city properties
140 around the City.

141 **Update on RAPZ Projects – Russ Akina, Parks & Recreation Director (24:39)**

142 Russ Akina, Parks & Recreation Director, addressed the Council regarding RAPZ
143 (Recreation, Arts, Parks, and Zoos) projects. There are 9 ongoing projects, and of those, 5
144 are currently being primarily focused on. The other 4 projects have deadlines for the end
145 of this month. On a yearly basis, they typically receive \$400,000 - \$440,000.

146
147 The Logan Outdoor Recreation Complex is located near 200 S 1350 W. The majority of
148 the RAPZ group was put towards parking for Maple View Park, Disc Golf Course, and
149 the dog park along with connecting trails.

150
151 Logan Middle Canal Trail culvert at 1250 N 800 E is adjacent to USU softball field. The
152 culvert allows for the trail along 800 East and the stormwater ditch to connect to 1400 N.
153 The project will be completed by the end of the month.

154
155 The trail at 1800 S 1320 W is near completion including the installation of a chain link
156 fence that separates Logan River Estates from the Springs Subdivision. The trail connects
157 1800 S to the Logan River Trail.

158
159 Maple View Park at 200 S is nearly completed with two playgrounds to install. The
160 playgrounds will be installed at 200 S 1320 W. The project will be completed in Spring
161 2026.

162
163 The Trapper Park bridge has a project end date of December 31, 2025. The bridge has
164 arrived but has yet to be installed. Between December 08 – 18, it is anticipated that the
165 bridge will be moved to the site. The bridge requires adjustments at each end. The north
166 adjustment had been completed, the south adjustment remains to be completed.

167
168 The remaining 4 projects are: a new boiler at the aquatic center, the boiler has been
169 procured, and we are preparing to meet with the installer for the 2026 season. The disc
170 golf course pavilion and picnic tables will be ordered and placed near the parking lot of
171 the outdoor complex. It will be an amenity for the public to use and for the use of future
172 tournaments. A restroom will also be installed with the same schedule. Finally, the main
173 street pedestrian underpass at 600 S has retaining walls and will be completed in the
174 spring.

175
176 Councilmember A. Anderson emphasized the importance of the pedestrian underpass as
177 it will be a safe connection and allow public access under Main Street.

178 Mayor Daines remarked that the pass will be shared use, and the underpass will
179 accommodate bicycles as well.

180 Vice Chair Johnson added that the neighborhood is appreciative and eager for the
181 underpass to be open to the public.

182 No further Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

183 **COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

184

185 **Planning Commission Update – Chair Simmonds (41:06)**

186

187 Chair Simmonds reported the Planning Commission approved 9 residential units at 675 ½
188 North 500 West in the MR-9 zone. A new Dutch Brothers Coffee was approved south of
189 the South Walmart in the Commercial Zones. Two more amendments will come to the
190 Council as workshops.

191

192 **Board and Committee Reports – Vice Chair Johnson, Councilmember A. Anderson
193 and Councilmember López (32:32)**

194

195 Vice Chair Johnson reported virtually attending the Utah League of Cities & Towns
196 housing advisory committee. The Council and Planning Commission attended the joint
197 presentation of the General Plan. Public Works Director, Paul Lindhardt, and he
198 discussed the possibility of the creation of a BPAC (Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory
199 Committee) or Transportation Board. He participated in the election canvass and met
200 with Richard Anderson, Finance Director regarding further information/questions.

201

202 Councilmember A. Anderson stated the Library Board reported that the average daily
203 number of library patrons is 586 and the average daily circulation is 1400. Storytime last
204 month had 13 programs and 800 attendees along with 7 other children's events with 336
205 attendees. The library is actively being used. The Friends of the Logan Library are
206 helping with Christmas Train Display and volunteers are needed to sign up and is a great
207 way to support the library; visit <https://loganlibraryfriends.org/>. The Parks & Recreation
208 Board met, the ice rink is open. Please check the parks & recreation website for hours and
209 prices.

210

211 The Bear River Local Homeless Council discussed a variety of items including the Point-
212 in-Time count of the number of sheltered and unsheltered individuals experiencing
213 homelessness. It will be conducted on January 28, 2025 from midnight until 2 a.m.
214 Volunteers are welcome and needed. The warming center is open and available as of
215 Sunday. There were 17 guests on Sunday, and 22 guests last night. A community
216 education dinner was held at Bridgerland Technology College.

217

218 With the resignation of Mark. Anderson as councilmember, there is a vacancy on the
219 Council. State Code requires an appointment within 30 days of the tenured resignation.
220 The interview process will take place at the next council meeting. An application and
221 additional required documentation must be submitted to Teresa Harris, City Recorder by
222 Friday, December 05, 2025 at 5 p.m. At the December 16th meeting, an opening
223 statement will be given by applicants and questions will be asked by the Council to the
224 potential candidates. The selection process is an open vote by the Council.
225

226 Councilmember López reported that most meetings were cancelled or he was unable to
227 attend. He was able to attend the education dinner at Bridgerland Technology College. It
228 is another option for the youth to be involved in education and what comes beyond High
229 School. The Fine Arts Committee reviewed the final proposal for the mural at the
230 Softball Willow Park Complex, and changes were suggested. The America 250
231 Committee asked about the possibility of a mural with that theme in mind. Aaron Smith,
232 Neighborhood Improvement Manager will attend the next meeting to discuss the
233 possibility. He attended the Twinkle Lights Festival, and it was a well-attended event by
234 the community.
235

236 **Council Chair and Vice Chair for 2026 – Chair Simmonds ([41:47](#))**

237 Chair Simmonds stated that at this time the Chair & Vice Chair will be selected for next
238 year to be ready for the first council meeting held January 6, 2026.
239

240 Councilmember A. Anderson expressed reservations about selecting the Council Chair &
241 Vice Chair without the new Councilmembers.
242

243 Councilmember López asked if the vote is delayed, could the Chair still assign the
244 Councilmembers to the new committees/subcommittees for 2026.
245

246 Chair Simmonds responded that it would be fine and asked if there is a preference to
247 continue the item until the first meeting in January of 2026.
248

249 Vice Chair Johnson is happy to be Chair, Vice Chair, or any other position. Any
250 councilmember can fill the position. Though he would find it unlikely that a new
251 councilmember would be appointed to be Chair or Vice Chair, and requested the vote
252 proceed today.
253

254 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Lopez seconded by Councilmember A.**
255 **Anderson to elect Vice Chair Johnson as the Council Chair for 2026 as presented.**
256

257 **Motion carried by roll call vote (3-0).**

258 **A. Anderson: Abstained**

259 **Johnson: Aye**

260 **López: Aye**

261 **Simmonds: Aye**
262 **VACANT**
263

264 **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson**
265 **to elect Councilmember López as the Council Vice Chair for 2026 as presented.**

266 **Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

267 **A. Anderson: Aye**
268 **Johnson: Aye**
269 **López: Aye**
270 **Simmonds: Aye**
271 **VACANT**
272

273 No further Council Business items were presented.
274

275 **ACTION ITEMS:**
276

277 **PUBLIC HEARING – CDBG PY 2026 Annual Action Plan Initiation – Mike**
278 **DeSimone, Community Development Director (47:50)**
279

280 Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director, addressed the Council. He
281 explained that only a public hearing to initiate the CDBG Annual Action Plan Cycle for
282 Project Year 2026 is required at this time and does not require formal action by the
283 Council.
284

285 The purpose of the public hearing is to help inform the CDBG Steering Committee when
286 they start meeting on determining what areas of the City should be emphasized, the types
287 of projects that should be accomplished this year, what services or programs may be
288 lacking, what particular groups of people may be in need of services, and what specific
289 planning projects the City may consider.
290

291 The 2026 AAP will define the funding priorities for 2026. This will be the third year of
292 the 2024-2028 Consolidated Plan and he anticipates receiving approximately \$560,000 in
293 CDBG funding. Based on the Consolidated Plan's priorities, the funding outcome should
294 be approximately 60% to provide a suitable living environment (50% to infrastructure
295 and 10% to access and mobility), 20% to improve the capacity of public service providers
296 that serve Low Moderate Income residents (10% to public facilities and 10% to public
297 service improvements), and 20% to invest in CDBG planning and administration (5% to
298 planning and 15% to administration).
299

300 The timeline is the following:
301 December 15 – January 14 - Application Period
302 December 30 - Application Workshop
303 February 10 – Steering Committee Meeting

304 March 21 – April 21 – Public Comment Period
305 April 21 – Public hearing (Adoption of the 2026 Annual Action Plan)
306
307
308 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.
309
310 There were no comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.
311
312 **PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed ordinance amending Section**
313 **8.04.019 of the Logan Municipal Code regarding the Wildland Urban Interface Code**
314 **– Ordinance 25-21 – Chief Nate Thompson, Logan City Fire Department (51:55)**
315
316 At the November 18, 2025 Council meeting, Robert LaCroix, Assistant Chief of Operations
317 with the Logan City Fire Department, addressed the Council regarding the proposed
318 ordinance.
319
320 At this meeting, Assistant Chief LaCroix explained that the State legislature has granted
321 general welfare power to the City Council, independent, apart from, and in addition to, its
322 specific grants of legislative authority, which enables the City of Logan to pass ordinances
323 as are necessary and proper to provide for the safety, promote the prosperity, improve the
324 peace and good order, comfort, and convenience of the city and its inhabitants, and for the
325 protection of property in the city. In the 2025 Utah General Session, the Utah state
326 legislature passed House Bill 48 requiring municipalities to adopt the 2006 Utah Wildland-
327 Urban Interface Code (WUI) which states:
328
329 **SECTION 1:**
330
331 8.04.019: 2006 UTAH WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE CODE ADOPTED:
332
333 For the purpose of prescribing regulations governing conditions hazardous to life and
334 property from impacts related to development in wildlands, the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban
335 Interface Code, as adopted by Utah Code Section 15A-2-103, or its successor, is hereby
336 adopted. A copy of the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban Interface Code shall be placed on file
337 in the office of the Logan City Recorder for the use and examination of the public.
338
339 Chair Simmonds referenced the WUI slide and inquired why the City's boundary is more
340 than the high-risk boundary.
341
342 Fire Chief Nate Thompson explained that the high-risk boundary map has yet to be
343 released by the State. The current boundary is an estimated boundary based on available
344 data. The State is using a tool to be more accurate, but the data has yet to be released.
345

346 Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that the City will amend the current map once
347 the State releases the official high-risk boundary map.

348

349 Fire Chief Thompson confirmed that an amendment would be made to adopt the State
350 high-risk boundary map, but would need to be reviewed with the City Attorneys
351 regarding building restrictions, liability, and so forth.

352

353 Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that it is state mandated to make
354 these changes.

355

356 Fire Chief Thompson confirmed that it is mandated by the State, but this is the 2006 Utah
357 Wildland Urban Interface Code. This keeps the City compliant with CWS program,
358 which is the cooperative wildfire system. In the event a fire spreads into wildland, it
359 protects the City from the cost of a wildfire by using State & Federal Resources.

360

361 Vice Chair Johnson requested clarification that there are no existing buildings in the
362 high-risk zone, and that staff is comfortable with the proposed boundaries.

363

364 Fire Chief Thompson clarified that there are no existing buildings in that zone. Staff did
365 discuss the proposed boundaries and determined that it would be better to wait once the
366 State releases its data and produces the high-risk map for use. At which point, staff can
367 make an adjustment as needed.

368

369 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

370

371 Gail Yost, a resident of Logan asked if there was a plan in place if a fire that descended
372 from the mountain to 100 East.

373

374 Fire Chief Thompson responded that 100 East is at a low risk for wildfire. A critical
375 factor that would change that scenario is variable winds, which are wind-driven events.
376 The risk is low but not impossible.

377

378 There were no further comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.

379

380 **ACTION. Motion Councilmember A. Anderson by Vice Chair Johnson seconded**
381 **by to adopt Ordinance 25-21 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

382 **A. Anderson: Aye**

383 **Johnson: Aye**

384 **López: Aye**

385 **Simmonds: Aye**

386 **VACANT**

387

388 **PUBLIC HEARING - CODE AMENDMENT – Consideration of a proposed**
389 **amendment to Chapter 5.10 of the Logan Municipal Code “Alcoholic Beverages” –**
390 **Ordinance 25-22 – Aaron Smith, Neighborhood Improvement Manager (1:05:30)**

391
392 At the November 18, 2025 Council meeting, Neighborhood Improvement Manager
393 Aaron Smith addressed the Council regarding the proposed code amendment.

394
395 **Summary of Amendment**

396 Logan City Business Licensing is proposing an amendment to LMC Section 5.10:
397 Alcohol Beverages to make additional bar licenses available by consolidating bar and
398 tavern licenses into a single category of licensing, and to establish a proximity restriction
399 between existing bar and tavern licenses, and any new bar and tavern license. This
400 amendment is prompted by the Business Licensing Division receiving an application for
401 a bar license at an existing alcohol manufacturing location in the Industrial Park zone.

402
403 Currently, Logan City limits the total available bar and tavern licenses by population. The
404 licensing standard is one (1) bar license per 10,000 population and one (1) tavern license
405 per 10,000 population. This restriction allow for a total of five bars and five (5) tavern
406 licenses available to be issued. All available bar licenses have been issued and only one
407 (1) available tavern license has been issued. This amendment proposes to create new
408 available bar licenses by combining the available bar and tavern licenses into a single
409 license pool. The combined license pool population restriction would also be adjusted to
410 one (1) license per 6,000 population, which creates a pool of nine (9) total bar and/or
411 tavern licenses. With 6 bar or tavern licenses currently issued, 3 new licenses would
412 become available for either a new bar or tavern.

413
414 Staff considered several potential population limits for the proposed amendment ranging
415 from 1:5,000 to 1:10,000. Staff considered how many licenses the options would make
416 available and how often new licenses would become available based on population
417 growth. The Bar and Tavern License Combination Study provides a further explanation
418 of these considerations and is attached to this memo. A 1:5,000 population limit would
419 combine the current 5 bar and 5 tavern licenses into a pool of 10 licenses; however, staff
420 is concerned that creating four available licenses could lead to faster than anticipated
421 growth of bars in Logan if all licenses are utilized (assuming bar licenses are available
422 through DABS). It would also create a scenario where new licenses would become
423 available more often based on population growth. In order to limit the creation of new
424 licenses and temper the rate of new licenses becoming available through population
425 growth, staff is recommending a population limit of 1:6,000 for the new combined bar
426 and tavern license pool. As previously stated, this limit will create a pool of nine (9)
427 licenses available for either a bar or tavern. With six (6) bar or tavern licenses currently
428 issued, three (3) new licenses would become available for either a new bar or tavern.

429 Regarding new licenses relative to population growth, with a current population of
430 approximately 54,000 and a 1% growth rate, the license pool will increase to 10 around
431 2034.

432

433 The amendment also proposes a proximity restriction that would not permit a new bar or
434 tavern within 350' of an existing bar or tavern establishment. This proposal is based on
435 similar codes found in other Utah municipalities, namely Ogden and Salt Lake City. Salt
436 Lake uses a straight-line proximity restriction in neighborhood commercial zones, and
437 Ogden uses a total amount of licenses along a particular street to limit alcohol
438 establishments in an area. The proximity restriction is being proposed to reduce the
439 concentration of bars or taverns along any single street in Logan. For reference, the 350'
440 proximity requirement is a little more than half a typical downtown block in Logan. The
441 proposed proximity restriction would be in addition to current State community location
442 proximity restrictions, which are a 200' straight line buffer and a 600' ordinary pedestrian
443 travel restriction from the nearest boundary of the community location to the closest
444 pedestrian entrance to the alcohol establishment. Community locations include churches,
445 schools, parks, playgrounds, and libraries. The attached Proximity Restriction Maps show
446 the impact of the proposed 350' license buffer and an approximation of the State
447 proximity restrictions. The zones where bars and taverns are permitted are also shown
448 (TC-1, TC-2, MU, CS and IP). While large areas of downtown Logan would not be
449 eligible for a license, there remain areas, particularly on the north and south ends of
450 downtown, that would be eligible for a license.

451

452 **Bar and Tavern Zoning Use and Previous Alcohol Amendment**

453 Ordinance #24-03 revised the zoning categories for most alcohol uses in Logan,
454 including bars and taverns. The Ordinance permits bars and taverns in the Town Center
455 and Mixed-Use zones. The Ordinance also established standalone manufacturing as a
456 permitted use in the Commercial Services and Industrial Park and created an allowance
457 for bars and taverns to be established at manufacturing locations in those zones.

458

459 **License Information and Definitions**

460

461 **Bar**

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

- Logan Municipal Code: Bar establishment license means one of the following types of licenses as defined by the UABC: a dining club license, equity license, fraternal license or bar license.
- 21 and over age restriction
- Beer, heavy beer (ABV greater than 5%), wine, and liquor
- Must have food available, but no percentage of food sales requirement
- Current local license limits-1:10,000 population
- 5 licenses available / 5 licenses issued
- Current licenses
 - The Cache Bar and Grill - 119 S Main

472 o Fraternal Order of Eagles - 170 W 900 N
473 o Barrel & Stave - 33 Federal Ave
474 o Home Range Brewing - 186 N Main
475 o Logan Country Club - 710 N 1500 E
476

477 **Tavern**

478 • DABS: Taverns are defined as beer bars, parlors, lounges, cabarets, and
479 nightclubs.
480 • 21 and over age restriction
481 • 5% ABV Beer or less
482 • No food requirement
483 • Current local license limits-1:10,000 population
484 • 5 licenses available / 1 license issued
485 • Current licenses
486 o The White Owl - 36 W Center
487

488 **Manufacturing**

489 • Logan Municipal Code: Includes several scales of manufacturing
490 o Brewery, distillery, or winery- Permitted in the IP zone
491 o Small Brewery, Distillery, Winery- Permitted in the CS and IP zones
492 o Taproom - Permitted in conjunction with a bar or tavern in TC-1, TC-2,
493 and MU zones
494 o Brew Restaurant - Permitted in conjunction with a restaurant
495 • Bars and taverns are permitted in conjunction with a manufacturing location
496 • Standalone manufacturing establishments that do not have a bar, tavern, or
497 restaurant license are only permitted to serve a 5 oz sample to the public.
498

499 **State License Information (July 2025)**

500 • 369 bar licenses issued by DABS (Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control)
501 • 8 tavern licenses issued by DABS
502 • County Data
503 o Cache (145,000) - 5 bar licenses
504 o Box Elder (64,000) - 5 bar licenses
505 o Tooele (84,000)-9 bar licenses
506 o Washington (207,000)-11 bar licenses
507 o Weber (276,000)- 32 bar licenses
508

509 **Amendment Goals:**

510 • Create additional available bar licenses – All available bar licenses have been
511 issued
512 • Consolidation of bar and tavern licenses into one license pool
513

514 • Application received from licensed alcohol manufacturing location in
515 Logan for a bar license.
516 • Create buffers around bars and taverns to reduce the risk of potential geographic
517 concentrations of either license type

519 **Amendment Proposal:**

520 • Genesis of the Amendment - Interest from licensed manufacturing location to
521 acquire a bar license
522 • Combine the pool of available bar and tavern licenses into a single pool
523 • 1 license per 6,000 population
524 • Current pool (both 1:10,000 population)
525 • Bar - 5 licenses available / 5 licenses issued
526 • Tavern - 5 licenses available / 1 license issued
527 • Proposed pool
528 • 1:6,000 population
529 • Bar or tavern – 9 licenses available / 6 licenses issued / 1 application
530 • 2 licenses for either a bar or tavern available

533 **Amendment Proposal - Number of Licenses:**

534 • 1 license per 6,000 population proposal
535 • Currently 10 licenses are available for bars and tavern
536 • Proposal creates combined license pool of 9 total licenses
537 • Likely to see interest in remaining available licenses for bars
538 • dependent upon availability of licenses from the DABS
539 • Other population ratios considered
540 • 1:5,000 population - creates 10 licenses, but would create a
541 scenario where new licenses become available considerably faster
542 than the current 1:10,000 for both bars and taverns
543 • 1:7,000 population – fewer total licenses (7) and slow growth of
544 new licenses
545 • 1:10,000 population – Inadequate number of licenses

548 **Amendment Proposal – Bar & Tavern Proximity:**

549 • Goal of Proximity Regulation
550 • Create buffers around bars and taverns to reduce the risk of geographic
551 concentrations of either license type
552 • Precedent from Ogden and SLC
553 • Ogden – Number of licenses along a single street
554 • SLC – Distance buffer in community/neighborhood commercial zones
555 • Proposal

- No new bar or tavern establishment within 350' of an existing bar or tavern
- Does not affect license for existing bar or tavern establishments (grandfathered)
- 350' Proximity Buffer
 - Roughly half a city block
 - Allows for walking distance between establishments but prohibits an entire street or corner from becoming a series of bars or taverns
 - 350' buffer is in addition to the existing State proximity requirements

567 Councilmember A. Anderson requested a visual example of 350 ft.

568 Aaron Smith, Neighborhood Improvement Manager replied that it is about half a block.

569 Vice Chair Johnson inquired if there are existing limitations in proximity of a tavern or bar
570 from each other.

571 Mr. Smith responded that currently there are no existing limitations except at a State level
572 and it is from a bar/tavern to a community location such as a church, school, park, and so
573 forth.

574 Councilmember López asked if the only existing tavern license would become a bar
575 license, and if they could apply to change to a bar.

576 Mr. Smith answered that tavern would remain a tavern, there would be no change. If the
577 tavern did reapply, they would very unlikely not be approved as they would not be able to
578 meet certain criteria such as setbacks.

579 Councilmember López inquired how the number/increase of licenses compared to other
580 jurisdictions.

581 Mr. Smith referenced the state license data slide (July 2025), the information presented can
582 be found in the bullet points above under state license information.

583 Vice Chair Johnson also referenced the state license data slide (July 2025) and asked if all
584 5 bar licenses in Cache County are in fact in the City.

585 Mr. Smith clarified that the 5 licenses in the County are in Logan City. He added that St.
586 George City removed all population limitations on alcoholic licenses.

587 Councilmember López asked if St. George still retained the proximity restriction.

588 Mr. Smith responded that he is not aware if St. George has a proximity restriction.

600
601 Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that the change allows for at least two more
602 bar licenses.
603
604 Mr. Smith confirmed that potentially two more bar licenses will be available (and the
605 current pending application).
606
607 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.
608
609 Ben Keeney, is a proponent and is in favor of the change as he would like to apply for a
610 bar license.
611
612 Lin Stewart, a resident of Wellsville is in favor of the ordinance and supports small
613 businesses including bars.
614
615 Linda Johnson, a resident of Logan is not opposed to the ordinance but is not in favor of
616 the proximity limitations as it adds an unnecessary complexity.
617
618 Carrie Bentley, a resident of Mendon is in favor of the change and appreciates the choice.
619
620 Chris Bentley, a resident of Mendon is in favor and would like to see more variety and
621 allow more opportunities for the community.
622
623 There were no further comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.
624
625 Councilmember López inquired if there was an alternate proximity restriction considered.
626
627 Mr. Smith answered that there was no alternative proximity restriction considered by
628 staff. He also referenced the bar and tavern proximity slide, which showed current bars
629 and taverns in proximity to each other and the existing State buffer from community
630 locations.
631
632 Chair Simmonds requested clarification on whether the City is creating a smaller or
633 bigger barrier than the State did.
634
635 Mr. Smith clarified that the State created a larger barrier than what the City is proposing.
636
637 Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that bars/taverns are only permitted
638 Towncenter 1 & 2 , Mixed Use, Commercial Services, and Industrial.
639
640 Mr. Smith confirmed that these are the only zones where bars/taverns are permitted and
641 explained that commercial and industrial require being in close proximity of the
642 manufacturing location.

643
644 Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that the existing bars/taverns are
645 grandfathered as they were put in place prior to changes to the State Code.
646
647 Mr. Smith confirmed that existing bars/taverns are grandfathered.
648
649 Councilmember López inquired what areas would still be able to have bars.
650
651 Mr. Smith indicated on the slide that the pink area shown is the only location where it
652 would be possible to have a bar or tavern.
653
654 Vice Chair Johnson is concerned about the ordinance. His primary concern is whether it
655 is prudent to allow more bar/taverns as he is concerned about the negative impact of
656 alcohol.
657
658 Councilmember A. Anderson understood the sentiments of Vice Chair Johnson having
659 had similar discussions with the Police. The understanding is that in licensed
660 establishments there is more control on drinking as the bartender will stop serving
661 alcohol to a patron. Drinking at home, however, is usually unchecked.
662
663 Mayor Daines added that bars/taverns do have liability and are generally careful to ensure
664 that patrons are not overserved.
665
666 Councilmember López remarked there are limited options for night life and having
667 alternatives. The City is not tasked with creating those options, but at the same time not
668 overly restricting and not permitting those opportunities to others.
669
670 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember
671 López to adopt Ordinance 25-22 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (3-1).**
672 **A. Anderson: Aye**
673 **Johnson: Abstain**
674 **López: Aye**
675 **Simmonds: Aye**
676 **VACANT**
677
678 **PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustment FY 2025-2026 appropriating \$31,528**
679 **funds received for police overtime shifts - Resolution 25-47 – Richard Anderson**
680 **(1:25:30)**
681
682 At the November 18, 2025 Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed
683 the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustment.
684
685 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

686
687 There were no comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing
688
689 **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember López to**
690 **approve Resolution 25-47 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**
691 **A. Anderson: Aye**
692 **Johnson: Aye**
693 **López: Aye**
694 **Simmonds: Aye**
695 **VACANT**
696
697 **WORKSHOP ITEMS:**
698
699 **Consideration of a proposed resolution approving Logan City's Withdrawal from**
700 **the Logan-Cache Airport Authority – Resolution 25-46 – Craig Carlston, City**
701 **Attorney ([1:26:38](#))**
702
703 City Attorney Craig Calston addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution. He
704 stated that the City of Logan and Cache County entered into an Agreement on May 16,
705 1978 when the City conveyed certain real property to be used for the operation of the
706 Logan-Cache Airport (“Airport”) and the County agreed to assume responsibility for the
707 maintenance and operation of the Airport. On December 1, 1992, the Parties entered an
708 Interlocal Agreement that created the Logan-Cache Airport Authority (“Airport
709 Authority”) as a separate legal entity and set forth the terms governing the Parties’ joint
710 development, operation and maintenance of the Airport. Logan and Cache County have
711 determined that the County is best positioned to continue the management, maintenance
712 and operation of the Airport and it is in the Parties’ mutual best interests for the City to
713 withdraw from the Airport Authority. The 1992 Agreement sets forth the conditions
714 under which a Party may withdraw from the Airport Authority, including the right of a
715 Party to withdraw with, or without cause. The 1992 Agreement requires the legislative
716 body of the Party desiring to withdraw from the Airport Authority to pass a resolution
717 authorizing the withdrawal which is what is being proposed at this time.
718 Vice Chair Johnson asked if the County Council would also need to approve the
719 withdrawal of the City from the airport?
720
721 Craig Carlston, City Attorney replied that the Cache County Council will also need to
722 approve the withdrawal.
723
724 Mayor Daines added that the County Council will be considering the item tonight.
725
726 Chair Simmonds inquired what the reasoning for the withdrawal was.
727

728 Mayor Daines explained that the City has been considering withdrawal from the airport
729 for some time. In a recent consultant's report, the findings suggested significant capital
730 expenses going forward. Furthermore, a recommendation for only one entity to be
731 directing the airport rather than two. If the airport does well, it will benefit the entire
732 County.

733
734 Chair Simmonds asked if the City would continue to own the property, and if changes
735 would still come to the City/Planning Commission.

736
737 Mayor Daines clarified that the property is owned by the airport authority, and the
738 County added to the property originally as well.

739
740 Mr. Carlston explained that there would be zoning authority, but not management
741 authority.

742
743 Russ Holley, Planner said that the City can still set design standards as the airport is a
744 zone and is within the City, and would have some level of review.

744
745 Chair Simmonds inquired what would occur with the overlay.

746
747 Mr. Holley responded that the overlay would remain as it has to do with height and use
748 restrictions, and what can be built in that area. The majority of the airport is within the
749 City, the only other portion that is in Unincorporated County is the extension of the
750 runway.

751
752 Mr. Carlston said the process of approval for zoning or a building permit would remain
753 the same as any other entity.

754
755 Councilmember A. Anderson asked what would occur if the County Council did not
756 waive the 6-month waiting period.

757
758 Mayor Daines answered that the notice would still be posted, but the City would wait six
759 months.

760
761 Chair Simmonds inquired if there would be a public hearing.

762
763 Mayor Daines replied that there will not be a public hearing as it is an administrative
764 matter, but public comments and concerns can be sent to Council.

765
766 Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that the City would still have seats
767 on the board and if the airport is ever sold, 50% of assets will return to the City.

770 Mr. Carlston confirmed that the City will retain seats on the board and if the property is
771 ever sold, 50% of the assets will return to the City.

772

773 Vice Chair Johnson requested an explanation on why a public hearing will not be held.

774

775 Mr. Carlston explained that the code requires a public hearing for items such as land use,
776 budget, real property sales. However, this administrative action is not the sale of property
777 or any other measure as such a public hearing is not required.

778

779 Councilmember López asked if the Council could elect to have a public hearing.

780

781 Mr. Carlston answered that Council may choose to add a public hearing.

782

783 Vice Chair Johnson is in favor of adding a public hearing.

784

785 Councilmember López inquired if the option of a public hearing needs to be voted on
786 now.

787

788 Teresa Harris, City Recorder replied that Council merely needs to inform her of their
789 preference/decision.

790

791 Vice Chair Johnson asked as to the reason for waiving the 6-month waiting period and
792 trying to exit out of the agreement sooner.

793

794 Mr. Carlston explained that the reason for the 6-month waiting period is if there are
795 complications or disagreements on any matter, then the City & Council are on the same
796 page.

797

798 Vice Chair Johnson inquired if the item would go to the rest of the Airport Authority
799 Board.

800

801 Mayor Daines responded that the item will come to the airport authority board.

802

803 Vice Chair Johnson expressed concerns on whether the County is in the best position to
804 run the airport.

805

806 Richard Anderson , Finance Director said that the primary issue has always been double
807 taxation. The residents of Logan are taxed twice in any project that City participates
808 equally with the County. There will not be a difference in benefits with the City departing
809 from the agreement beyond the above-mentioned reason.

810

811 Vice Chair Johnson asked if it would be possible to amend the current agreement in order
812 to remove double taxation.

813
814 Mr. Anderson answered that it would not be possible to amend the contract and remove
815 double taxation. Anytime the County and City participate equally, there is always a
816 double taxation clause.
817
818 Chair Simmonds remarked that the only possible way is for an interlocal agreement to be
819 signed by the City and County without requiring any financial obligation. However, an
820 airport authority board would not be possible without a budget.
821
822 Councilmember A. Anderson is not opposed to the dissolution as the runway needs to be
823 replaced.
824
825 Chair Simmonds commented that some members of the board are in favor of adding
826 hangers and making it a more corporate environment, where hangers are rented out. If the
827 airport needs to function as it suggested, then it needs to be run by a board invested in the
828 airport itself.
829
830 Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that the City would still retain seats on the
831 board.
832
833 Mayor Daines confirmed that the City would retain a seat on the board.
834
835 Vice Chair Johnson asked who would be appointed to fill the two seats.
836
837 Chair Simmonds replied that the presumption is that the Mayor would appoint the board
838 member with Council approval.
839
840 Mayor Daines clarified that the Mayor or Council do not need to serve on the board
841 rather an appointee.
842
843 Vice Chair Johnson agreed that \$100,000 per year can be steep, but long-term whether it
844 is a prudent decision.
845
846 Mayor Daines pointed out that if the airport follows the master plan, there are expected to
847 be large expenses. There will be federal funding to pay for some of the projects, but there
848 is still a hefty sum to match.
849
850 Councilmember López requested an example of what the cost will be for some of the
851 airport projects.
852
853 Mayor Daines could not recall a number, but the sum will be easily over \$5 to \$10
854 million.
855

856 Chair Simmons commented that in order for an airport authority to expand, the FDA
857 requires a tax entity.

858

859 Mayor Daines added that if there is only one entity in the decision-making process, it will
860 streamline the process even if there is private investment.

861

862 Vice Chair Johnson inquired if the Airport Authority would still be making the decision if
863 there was a private investment or if it would still be the entity in charge, the County.

864

865 Mr. Anderson stated that the current agreement would require approval from all existing
866 entities, which would be the County and City.

867

868 Vice Chair Johnson asked what would occur to the airport if the County does not have
869 funding in 10 years, and the City is not an active entity.

870

871 Mr. Carlston answered that the airport would close, and half of the assets would belong to
872 the County & the other to the City.

873

874 Mayor Daines interjected that the County is working the USU to have an agreement in
875 place about supporting the airport.

876

877 Mr. Anderson added that the County is in best position to run the airport. They are the
878 only entity that can receive or benefit from the whole impact of the airport. If the City
879 runs the airport and invests funding, the City will benefit, but the entire County will not.
880 Versus the County will benefit as some of the companies are located elsewhere in the
881 valley and not in the City.

882

883 Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that the airport is supported by general tax
884 dollars.

885

886 Mr. Anderson confirmed that the airport funding comes from general tax dollars.

887

888 Chair Simmonds noted that the City only receives a small portion of general tax dollars
889 and returns that funding to the airport.

890

891 Mr. Anderson stated that the City often invests in county-wide investments, but going
892 forward the County will reap the benefits of any long-term investment, while the City
893 will marginally, if at all. The County has the best opportunity to make the airport
894 successful.

895

896 The proposed resolution will be an action item at the December 18, 2025 Council
897 meeting.

898

899 **REZONE – Consideration of a proposed rezone. Jonathan Shill/YABC LLC**
900 **authorized agent/owner is requesting a zone change of 2.52 acre property located at**
901 **920 North 200 West from Mixed Residential Low (MR-12) to Commercial (COM) in**
902 **the Bridgerland Neighborhood) – Ordinance 25-23 – Aimee Egbert, Planner**
903 **(1:50:40)**

904
905 Planner Aimee Egbert addressed the Council regarding the proposed rezone.
906

907 **PROJECT**

908 The applicant is requesting to rezone a 2.52-acre parcel from Mixed Residential Low
909 (MR-12) to Commercial (COM). The applicant stated that the purpose of the rezone is to
910 allow the installation of an 8-foot perimeter fence, which exceeds the 6-foot height limit
911 permitted in the MR-12 zoning district. The applicant has also indicated that the rezone
912 would support potential future expansion of the existing building footprint consistent
913 with commercial development standards.

914
915 **BACKGROUND**

916 The City of Logan adopted Zoning regulations in August of 1950. The property's zoning
917 history shows that the property was designated either residential or a type of community
918 commercial throughout the years:

919
920 The subject property is approximately 2.52 acres in size and contains an existing
921 commercial building originally constructed in the early 1960s, with additions completed
922 in 1983. The building previously housed Kubex Fitness beginning in 2020 and was
923 recently purchased by YABC, LLC for use as office space.

924
925 Over the years, the property has supported a variety of commercial uses, including a
926 sports and fitness club, medical offices, day spa, electronic service company, and
927 restaurant, among others. In 1997, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) was approved to
928 legally establish the commercial use within the residential zoning district, and because
929 the commercial use was not abandoned, is still valid. At present, there are no residential
930 uses on the property.

931
932 **LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE**

933 The subject property is currently zoned Mixed Residential Low (MR-12), which does not
934 permit commercial office uses without a CUP or fence heights exceeding six feet. Both of
935 these uses are, however, allowed within a commercially zoned district. The COM zone
936 provides for a broad range of commercial activities, including office, retail, and service-
937 oriented uses that are intended for businesses that serve city-wide or regional populations
938 in areas along high-capacity roads.

939
940 The subject property is located along collector roads with lower traffic volumes and
941 speeds, and which are not intended to accommodate high-intensity commercial activity.

942 According to the LDC Land Use Table, the COM zone allows approximately 45
943 permitted uses, including gas stations, pawn shops, and commercial parking lots, which
944 may be incompatible with the surrounding multifamily residential development. In
945 contrast, the CC zone requires CUPs for many higher-impact uses, providing the
946 Planning Commission with greater discretion to review and condition specific
947 commercial activities to ensure they are compatible with the area.

948

949 **GENERAL PLAN**

950 The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) designates the subject area as Mixed Residential, with
951 the adjacent property to the south identified as Mixed Use Commercial (MUC). Staff
952 finds that the CC (Community Commercial) designation more accurately reflects the
953 existing and intended character of the subject property and would be more consistent with
954 the surrounding land use pattern.

955

956 **SUMMARY**

957 The subject parcel was originally zoned R-3, which permitted both commercial and
958 residential uses when Logan City first adopted zoning regulations, and has been used for
959 commercial purposes since the mid-1960s. Surrounding uses include a church to the
960 north; a social club, realty office, and ball fields to the south; and apartment
961 developments to the east and west, with a commercial zone located approximately half a
962 block to the east. While rezoning the property to COM would bring the existing use into
963 conformance, it would also allow a range of higher-intensity commercial uses that may
964 be incompatible with the surrounding residential area. Therefore, staff recommends
965 forwarding a denial of the proposed Commercial (COM) zoning designation and approval
966 of rezoning to Community Commercial (CC). The CC zone, consistent with adjacent
967 properties to the south, would better align with the established land use pattern and
968 neighborhood context, and the existing CUP would bring compliance to the CC zoning
969 designation.

970

971 **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

972 No comments have been received.

973

974 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

975 Notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. As of the
976 time of this report, one comment has been received in approval of the rezone.

977

978 **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

979 Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 11/1/25, posted on the City's
980 website and the Utah Public Meeting website on 11/3/25, and noticed in a quarter page ad
981 on 10/27/25.

982

983 **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR COM DENIAL**

984 The Planning Commission bases its decision on the following findings:

985 1. LDC 17.10.080 states that the COM (Commerical) zone is intended for retail, service,
986 and hospitality uses that serve citywide or regional populations and located on high-
987 capacity roads.
988 2. LDC 17.11.030 for the COM zone allows a wide range of high-intensity commercial
989 uses that are incompatible with adjacent multifamily and institutional uses.
990 3. The surrounding collector streets are not designed to accommodate the traffic
991 volumes or access demands associated with higher-intensity commercial uses.
992 4. The current FLUP calls this property out as Mixed Residential (MR).
993

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR CC APPROVAL

The Planning Commission bases its decision on the following findings:

996 1. The property has operated for community-scale commercial purposes since the mid-
997 1960s, and rezoning to CC would maintain compatibility with the neighborhood and
998 still allow for smaller scale commercial uses.
999 2. The CC zone provides a more appropriate transition between surrounding residential
1000 and commercial uses and is consistent with adjacent zoning to the south.
1001 3. The rezone supports continued use of the site without adverse impacts to public
1002 health, safety, or welfare, and the property is adequately served by existing
1003 infrastructure and access.

1004
1005 On November 13th, 2025, the Planning Commission **recommended denial** to the
1006 Municipal Council for the YABC, LLC rezone to Commercial as proposed by the
1007 applicant. **Planning Commissioners vote to recommend denial (6-0)**. (Proponent was
1008 not there to discuss possibility or option of Community Commercial as an alternative).
1009

1010 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the proponent is requesting a Commercial rezone
1011 just to have an 8-foot fence (as it is not permitted in a residential zone).
1012

1013 Aimee Egbert, Planner replied that the proponent purchased the property recently. They
1014 do have a building permit to turn the property into offices and expand the building in
1015 time.
1016

1017 Vice Chair Johnson inquired if an 8 foot fence can be built in community commercial.
1018

1019 Ms. Egbert responded that a 8 foot fence could be built in a community commercial zone,
1020 which is what staff recommended.
1021

1022 Vice Chair Johnson requested a brief explanation of the differences between commercial
1023 and community commercial.
1024

1025 Ms. Egbert explained that community commercial is small intensity/density impact, and
1026 most uses are conditionally permitted. Commercial has 45 permitted uses, while
1027 community commercial has about 20 uses, which are conditional.

1028
1029 Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that a conditional permit must be issued if the
1030 criteria are met; it cannot be denied.
1031
1032 Ms. Egbert replied that a conditional permit cannot be denied, but conditions can be
1033 implemented.
1034
1035 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the FLUP also had the area remaining as MR-12.
1036
1037 Ms. Egbert responded that the area in the upcoming FLUP will likely change to
1038 community commercial.
1039
1040 The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the December 18,
1041 2025 Council meeting.
1042
1043 **CODE AMENDMENT – Consideration of a proposed ordinance amending the**
1044 **Land Development Code Chapter 17.60 “Administrative Enforcement” to include**
1045 **Storm Water Violation Fees as required by Utah Code Annotated, Section 19-5-**
1046 **108.3 – Ordinance 25-24 – Russ Holley, Planner ([1:58:15](#))**
1047
1048 Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council regarding the proposed code amendment.
1049
1050 **RECOMMENDATION**
1051 Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend **approval** to the
1052 Municipal Council of the proposed amendments to Chapters 17.60 Administrative
1053 Enforcement.
1054
1055 **REQUEST**
1056 This is a proposal to add a new section to the 17.60 Administrative Enforcement chapter
1057 named Storm Water Violation Fees. This addition will ensure that the Logan City Land
1058 Development Code matches the State of Utah Code for storm water violation fees.
1059
1060 The new section 17.60.440.5 is proposed to be added below 17.60.440 Civil Fees
1061 Assessed and will unify City Codes with State Codes in this matter. The proposal
1062 includes a clause that if State Codes change in the future, the City Code will reference
1063 and follow the new change. Standard legal processes on this matter are not altered with
1064 this proposal.
1065
1066 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
1067 These changes will help city staff be consistent and up to date with state regulations so
1068 that there is better overall understanding and less confusion within the development
1069 community and government regulators. Staff recommend that the Planning Commission
1070 send a recommendation of approval to the City Council.

1071
1072 **GENERAL PLAN**
1073 The Land Development Code was prepared and adopted to implement the vision
1074 expressed in the General Plan. The purpose of these code changes is to update and clarify
1075 provisions in the Land Development Code relative to General Plan goals and objectives.
1076

1077 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
1078 As of the time the staff report was prepared, no comments were received.
1079

1080 **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**
1081 Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 11/01/25 and posted on the City's
1082 website and the Utah Public Meeting website on 11/03/25.
1083

1084 **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**
1085 As of the time the staff report was prepared, no comments were received.
1086

1087 **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**
1088 The Planning Commission bases its decisions on the following findings:
1089 1. Utah State Law authorizes local Planning Commission to recommend ordinance
1090 changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).
1091 2. The Code Amendments are made in conformance with the requirements of Title 17.51
1092 of the Logan Municipal Code.
1093 3. The proposed Code Amendments are consistent with the Logan City General Plan.
1094 4. The proposed Code Amendments are consistent with UCA Title 10, Chapter 9a, Part 5
1095 & Part 6.
1096 5. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendments.
1097

1098 On November 13, 2025, the Planning Commission **recommended approval** to the
1099 Municipal Council for the Storm Water Violation Fees Code Amendment as proposed.
1100 **Planning Commissioners vote (6-0).**
1101

1102 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if it was likely for the State to frequently change
1103 stormwater violation fees.
1104

1105 Russ Holley, Planner replied that it is not frequent, but the State is likely to change the
1106 fee in the future.
1107

1108 The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the December 18,
1109 2025 Council meeting.
1110

1111 **Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$39,265,437 toward the**
1112 **construction of a new Public Works building and related improvements;**
1113 **\$10,000,000 funds to allow the Electric Fund to purchase the existing Public Works**

1114 **building; \$11,565 funds received for police overtime shifts - Resolution 25-48 –**
1115 **Richard Anderson, Finance Director (1:59:43)**

1116
1117 Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget
1118 adjustments. He explained that the \$49 million request plus what has already been
1119 appropriated for design and construction will bring the total to \$54 million to build a new
1120 public works building.

1121
1122 Mayor Daines said that Parks & Recreation, which is part of the general fund, would also
1123 move into the former Light & Power building and the project would include a storage
1124 area for them. The proposed funds would be used for the 3 departments and setting them
1125 up for the future.

1126
1127 Chair Simmons remarked that if there is an earthquake due to the semis concern about the
1128 roof of the service center, there is concern about the equipment stored there.

1129
1130 Mr. Anderson added that the original intent was for the facility to undergo seismic
1131 upgrades including replacing the roof. However, federal grants were not approved. The
1132 City has been saving for the past 10 years for a new public works building.

1133
1134 Councilmember A. Anderson requested Paul Lindhardt, Public Works Director, and Sam
1135 Odd, Public Works Project Manager speak about where all the equipment is repaired and
1136 maintained, and that some of the existing equipment no longer fits in the current building.

1137
1138 Paul Lindhardt, Public Works Director explained that some of the existing equipment no
1139 longer fits in the current building. The service center is where all the mechanics for the
1140 general fund are located. They service nearly all of the equipment for the City including
1141 fire trucks, ambulances, police vehicles, and City vehicles. The most recent equipment
1142 purchased won't fit in that building unless it goes through the East door. Some of the
1143 equipment does not fit in the area where equipment is typically parked, which is
1144 awkward, and instead must be put in another building.

1145
1146 Public Works has equipment in 4 different locations. Staff is in 3 different locations. Staff
1147 has to pick up the equipment at different locations and return it. Part of the goal is the
1148 efficiency of the crews and equipment. The new building will have less square footage,
1149 and a smaller footprint, but will use space more efficiently.

1150
1151 Chair Simmonds inquired if a small footprint would still be able to accommodate all the
1152 vehicles and equipment.

1153
1154 Mr. Lindhardt responded that the smaller footprint would permit storage of all/majority
1155 of the public works vehicles and equipment.

1157 Mayor Daines asked that Mr. Lindhardt explain the impact of weather on vehicles stored
1158 outside.

1159
1160 Mr. Lindhardt referenced an incident that occurred in Sandy City, where a fire destroyed
1161 their entire snowplow fleet. In the aftermath, a study was conducted by a consultant on
1162 the maintenance and cost of vehicles stored inside vs. outside. It showed that vehicles
1163 stored outside had shorter lifespans and more maintenance cost.

1164
1165 Similar finding conducted by Mike Beckstead, the Fleet Manager of the City showed that
1166 leaving vehicles outside for even one winter incurred greater cost of about 4 or 5 times
1167 the current annual maintenance cost.

1168
1169 Chair Simmonds commented that parking of the CONNECT bus fleet was one of the
1170 biggest reasons that CONNECT built a new transit center. However, sometimes large
1171 projects are needed to address a problem.

1172
1173 Councilmember López requested a visual presentation of the proposed public works
1174 building.

1175
1176 Mr. Lindhardt replied they will present a basic design to the Council members at the next
1177 meeting.

1178
1179 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the December 18,
1180 2025 Council meeting.

1181
1182 No further workshop items were presented.

1183
1184 **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

1185
1186 Councilmember A. Anderson congratulated Mayor Daines for receiving the Martha
1187 Huges Cannon Lifetime Achievement Award. Martha Hughes Cannon was the first
1188 woman elected to the Utah State Senate in 1887, and first woman elected to an official
1189 position in the entire nation.

1190
1191 Mayor Daines said it was an honor and appreciated the recognition.

1192
1193 Councilmember López stated that the Logan Youth Council is touring SOCC on
1194 December 10 at 3:30 p.m.

1195
1196
1197 No further considerations were discussed.

1198
1199 **ADJOURNED:**

1200
1201 There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned at 7:45 p.m.
1202
1203
1204
1205 Teresa Harris, City Recorder

DRAFT